REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **December 16, 2003**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sipple et al. (USPN 6,405,327, hereinafter "Sipple"), alSafadi et al. (USPN 6,467,088, hereinafter "alSafadi"), Smith et al. (USPN 5,848,250, hereinafter "Smith"), and Katz et al. (USPN 6,055,513, hereinafter "Katz").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(b)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Sipple, alSafadi, Smith, and Katz. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Sipple, alSafadi, Smith, and Katz teaches having the **user place an order** for an upgrade through either a telemarketer or by entering data at a website (see Katz, col. 13, lines 52-67).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to **automatically placing an order** for a memory upgrade and automatically communicating the details of the memory upgrade upon receiving concurrence of the user (see FIG. 4, block 414 and page 10, line 26 to page 11, line 7 of the instant application). Automatically placing the order by the system for a memory upgrade and automatically communicating the details of the memory upgrade is beneficial because it allows the system to provide information to the selling website and to provide feedback choices to the user without the user having to enter the information. Hence, the user does not need to be concerned with the details of what type memory to order and whether the ordered memory will work in the system. There is nothing within the combined system of Sipple, alSafadi, Smith, and Katz, either explicit or implicit, which suggests automatically placing an order for a memory upgrade and automatically communicating the details of the memory upgrade.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to include the limitations of dependent claims 2, 9, and 16, respectively to clarify that the present invention automatically places an order for a memory upgrade and automatically communicates the details of the memory upgrade. These amendments find support in FIG. 4, block 414, and on page 10, line 26 to page 11, line 7 of the instant application. Dependent claims 2, 9, and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 3, 10, and 17 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: March 12, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665